



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/598,598

08/17/2007

David Minodier

4976-006

7538

23429

7590

05/11/2009

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

1700 DIAGONAL ROAD

SUITE 300

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PITZENMAYER, MARK C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2447

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/11/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/598,598

## Applicant(s)

MINODIER ET AL.

## Examiner

MARK PFIZENMAYER

## Art Unit

2447

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 September 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/5/2006.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The claims 1-12 are pending.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because of the following formalities:
  - Fig. 3, item E303, "determination" has an unnecessary accent over the first "e".

#### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
  - "authorising" is repeatedly misspelled throughout the specification, e.g., page 3, paragraph 3.
4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the specification fails to provide antecedent basis for "computer readable medium" in claim 12, line 1.

***Claim Objections***

5. The claim 1 is objected to because of the following formalities:
- In claim 1, line 10, "authorising" is misspelled. The same error occurs in claim 11, line 11

***Double Patenting***

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1, 11 and 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10/598595. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of following reasons:

Claims 1-14 of copending Application No. 10/598595 contain(s) every element of claims 1, 11 and 12 of the instant application and thus anticipate the claim(s) of the instant application. Claims of the instant application therefore are not patently distinct from the earlier patent claims and as such are unpatentable over obvious-type double patenting. A later patent/application claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier claim if the later claim is anticipated by the earlier claim.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a 35 patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND

COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

“Claim 12 and Claim 13 are generic to the species of invention covered by claim 3 of the patent. Thus, the generic invention is **“anticipated”** by the species of the patented invention. Cf., Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (holding that an earlier species disclosure in the prior art defeats any generic claim). This court’s predecessor has held that, without a terminal disclaimer, the species claims preclude issuance of the generic application. In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 944, 214 USPQ 761, 767 (CCPA 1982); Schneller, 397 F.2d at 354. Accordingly, absent a terminal disclaimer, claims 12 and 13 were properly rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.” (In re Goodman (CA FC) 29 USPQ2d 2010 (12/3/1993).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

8. The term “computer readable medium” in claim 12, line1, has been interpreted to exclude any and all forms of transmission medium.
9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

With regard to claim 11, when "system" is given its broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification it claims an invention completely embodied in computer software. The claim lacks the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. It is clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor is it a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, it fails to fall within a statutory category. It is, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hare et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167338) in view of Sobel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,249,187).

With regard to claim 1, Hare teaches the client being able to transmit and/or receive information according to a point-to-point transport protocol via a telecommunication network (i.e., a client capable of connecting using PPPoE, pages 2-

3, section 0020, and Fig. 1, item 131) and a session concentrator which is able to transmit and/or receive information according to the point-to-point transport protocol (i.e., the concentrator receives the PPPoE frames, pages 2-3, section 0020), where the non-conforming clients are given access to a session concentrator (i.e., unsupported clients are given access to the concentrator, page 2, section 0015, and Fig. 1). Hare teaches non-conforming clients being set up on the telecommunication network and allowing access to the session concentrator (i.e., a unsupported client is given access to the concentrator via a LAN, WAN or the internet, page 2, section 0018 ), establishing a session between the non-conforming client and the session concentrator according to a point-to-point transport protocol (i.e., a virtual PPPoE session is established between the client and the concentrator), transferring, by the session concentrator, the information transmitted by the non-conforming client in the established session to a network for clients that conform to the access control protocol (i.e., both conforming and non-conforming clients are given access to a network via a concentrator, Fig. 1, item 160), and the network for conforming clients being set up on the telecommunication network and allowing access to the services provided by the service provider, and reciprocally (i.e., clients are given access to services provided by service providers, page 1, section 0002).

Hare does not teach the method being performed by using an access control protocol in the telecommunication network to control access to the services provided by the service provider, the method comprising determining whether or not the client conforms to the access control protocol, authorising the client that does not conform to



the access control protocol to access a network for non-conforming clients, and where the non-conforming clients are given access and sessions are established using a network for non-conforming clients. However, Sobel teaches the method being performed by using an access control protocol in the telecommunication network to control access to the services provided by the service provider (i.e., network access to a corporate network is controlled by security policies, col. 3, lines 45-55), the method comprising determining whether or not the client conforms to the access control protocol (i.e., a compliance verification component determines if the client complies with the security policies, col. 4, lines 17-21), authorising the client that does not conform to the access control protocol to access a network for non-conforming clients (i.e., non-compliant clients are given access to a restricted network, col. 5, lines 37-45), and where the non-conforming clients are given access and sessions are established using a network for non-conforming clients (i.e., non-compliant clients are assigned to a restricted network) in order to ensure compliance with network access policies (col. 1, lines 6-9). Therefore, based on Hare in view of Sobel, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Sobel in the system of Hare in order to ensure compliance with network access policies.

With regard to claim 2, Hare teaches wherein the method furthermore comprises the steps, carried out by the session concentrator, of: determining, among the information transmitted by the service provider in the network for conforming clients, information destined for the non-conforming client, transferring the determined

information to the non-conforming client in the established session between the non-conforming client and the session concentrator (i.e., the access concentrator provides data intended for receipt by the non-compliant client as PPPoE compliant frames, page 23, section 0022, over a network for compliant and non-compliant devices, Fig. 1).

With regard to claim 3, Hare teaches wherein a number of service providers can be accessed by clients (i.e., the concentrator provides access to a service provider, page 2, section 0017), each service provider being accessible via at least one network for clients that conform to the access control protocol (i.e., the concentrator provides access to a network, page 2, section 0017), and the method furthermore comprising determining the network for clients that conform to the access control protocol which allows access to the service provider for the non-conforming client, the determining step being carried out by the session concentrator, and transferring the information transmitted by the non-conforming client in the established session to the determined network for conforming clients (i.e., the client communicates in a bi-directional manner with one or more networks attached to the access concentrator, page 3, section 0025, therefore the concentrator must determine which of the networks the client was trying to reach).

With regard to claim 6, Hare and Sobel teach the subject matter of claim 1 above. Hare teaches wherein the client accesses the telecommunication network via a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor (i.e., the access concentrator can be a DSLAM, page 2, section 0017). As discussed in claim 1, Sobel teaches check in for compliance with an access protocol, and Hare further teaches the Digital Subscriber

Line Access Multiplexor determines whether or not the client conforms to the protocol (i.e., a gateway the determines compliance with a protocol that is attached to a DSLAM, Fig. 1, however a concentrator is capable supporting multiple architectures). Therefore, the limitations of claim 6 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With regard to claim 11, Hare teaches a system for access by a client to services provided by a service provider (i.e., client is given access to the private networks and the world wide web, page 2, section 0018), the client being able to transmit and/or receive information according to a point-to-point transport protocol via a telecommunication network (i.e., client communicates using PPPoE, page 2, section 0016), and a session concentrator which is able to transmit and/or receive information according to the point-to-point transport protocol (i.e., clients can communicate with the access concentrator using PPPoE, Abstract). Hare does not teach the telecommunication network including an access control protocol to control access to the services provided by the service provider, the system comprising: means for determining whether or not the client conforms to the access control protocol, means for authorising the client that does not conform to the access control protocol to access a network for non-conforming clients, the network for non-conforming clients being set up on the telecommunication network and allowing access to the session concentrator, means for establishing a session between the client and the session concentrator according to the point-to-point transport protocol on the network for non-conforming clients

However, Sobel teaches the telecommunication network including an access control protocol to control access to the services provided by the service provider (i.e., network access to a corporate network is controlled by security policies, col. 3, lines 45-55), the system comprising: means for determining whether or not the client conforms to the access control protocol (i.e., a compliance verification component determines if the client complies with the security policies, col. 4, lines 17-21), means for authorising the client that does not conform to the access control protocol to access a network for non-conforming clients (i.e., non-compliant clients are given access to a restricted network, col. 5, lines 37-45), the network for non-conforming clients being set up on the telecommunication network and allowing access to the session concentrator (i.e., Sobel teaches setting up a restricted network for non-compliant devices, cols. 2-3, lines 59-12, and Hare teaches allowing non-conforming clients access to a concentrator, Abstract, therefore teaching allowing access to the concentrator using the restricted network), means for establishing a session between the client and the session concentrator according to the point-to-point transport protocol on the network for non-conforming clients (i.e., as discussed above Hare teaches communicating with a concentrator using PPPoE and Sobel teaches assigning non-compliant clients to a separate network, therefore teaching assigning the PPPoE clients communicating with the concentrator that are not compliant to the restricted network), and means for transferring, by the session concentrator, the information transmitted by the non-conforming client in the established session to a network for clients that conform to the access control protocol, the network for conforming clients being set up on the telecommunication network and

allowing access to the services provided by the service provider, and reciprocally (i.e., Sobel teaches a network for compliant devices, cols. 2-3, lines 59-12, and Hare teaches connecting compliant devices to the concentrator, Abstract, therefore teaching allowing devices on the compliant network access to the concentrator and the services provided by the service provider) in order to ensure compliance with network access policies (col. 1, lines 6-9). Therefore, based on Hare in view of Sobel, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Sobel in the system of Hare in order to ensure compliance with network access policies.

With regard to claim 12, Hare and Sobel teach the subject matter of claim 1 above. Hare teaches a computer readable medium or storage device including a computer program, said program comprising instructions for enabling a computer to carry out the method according to claim 1 when it is loaded and run by a computer system (i.e., Fig. 1 teaches a system of computer components that must have program instructions for carrying out the disclosed invention stored therein).

13. Claims 4-5, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hare et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0167338) in view of Sobel et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,249,187), and further in view of Malik ("Network Security Principles and Practices", 15 November 2002, Cisco Press)

With regard to claim 4, Hare and Sobel teach the claimed subject matter as discussed above in claim 1. Additionally, Hare teaches wherein the step of establishing

the session between the non-conforming client and the session concentrator includes sub-steps, carried out by the session concentrator, of: receiving at least one broadcast message which is transmitted by the client on the network for clients, the broadcast message comprising at least the address of the client (i.e., a client using PPPoE, pages 2-3, section 0020, during the discovery phase of a PPPoE a client will send out a broadcast message to its neighbors that includes the client address). Hare and Sobel do not teach transferring on the network for clients at least one identification request message destined for the client. However, Malik teaches transferring on the network for clients at least one identification request message destined for the client (i.e., an EAP request packet is sent asking for the supplicant's identity, pages 5-6) in order to authenticate data communication between two devices (page 3). Therefore, based on Hare in view of Sobel, and further in view of Malik, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Malik in the s of Hare in order to authenticate data communication between two devices.

With regard to claim 5, Hare and Sobel do not teach wherein the step of establishing the session between the client and the session concentrator furthermore comprises sub-steps, carried out by the session concentrator, of receiving at least one message comprising at least one identifier which is transmitted by the client on the network for non-conforming clients, transferring the identifier to an authentication server, obtaining an authenticator for the client and transferring the authenticator to the authentication server, establishing the session if the authentication server authenticates

the client. However, Malik teaches wherein the step of establishing the session between the client and the session concentrator furthermore comprises sub-steps, carried out by the session concentrator, of receiving at least one message comprising at least one identifier which is transmitted by the client on the network for non-conforming clients (i.e., the EAP packet containing the client ID is sent to the authenticator, pages, 5-6), transferring the identifier to an authentication server (i.e., the packet containing the identifier is forwarded to the authentication server, pages 5-6), obtaining an authenticator for the client and transferring the authenticator to the authentication server (i.e., client sends a response to the challenge to the authenticator, pages 5-6), establishing the session if the authentication server authenticates the client (i.e., if the challenges is successful the port is opened, pages 5-6). Therefore, the limitations of claim 5 are rejected in the analysis of claim 4 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With regard to claim 7, Hare and Sobel teach the subject matter of claim 6 above. Additionally, Hare teaches wherein if the client conforms to the access control protocol in claim 6 above. Hare and Sobel do not teach where the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor authorises the client that conforms to the access control protocol to access a network for conforming clients, the network for conforming clients being set up on the telecommunication network and allowing access to a service provider. However, Malik teaches where the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor authorises the client that conforms to the access control protocol to access a network for conforming clients, the network for conforming clients being set up on the

telecommunication network and allowing access to a service provider (i.e., the authentication occurs at layer 2 by a layer 2 device, pages 2-3, and since a concentrator is a layer 2 device it teaches using the concentrator to authenticate and allow access to the network clients who comply with the 802.1x protocol.) in order to authenticate data communication between two devices (page 3). Therefore, based on Hare in view of Sobel, and further in view of Malik, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teaching of Malik in the system of Hare in order to authenticate data communication between two devices.

With regard to claim 8, Hare teaches wherein a number of service providers can be accessed by clients (i.e., the invention gives clients access to private networks and the world wide web, page 2, section 0018), each service provider being accessible via at least one network for clients that conform to the access control protocol (i.e., compliant clients are given access to the network, page 2, sections 0017-0018), and a Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor (i.e., DSLAM, page 2, section 0017) Hare does not teach the method furthermore comprises determining the network for clients that conform to the access control protocol which allows access to the service provider for the conforming client, and the determining step being carried out by the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor, and transferring the information transmitted by the conforming client to the determined network for conforming clients. However, Sobel teaches the method furthermore comprises determining the network for clients that conform to the access control protocol which allows access to the service provider



for the conforming client (i.e., security policy compliant devices are assigned to the compliant network, col. 3, lines 28-44), and the determining step being carried out by the Digital Subscriber Line Access Multiplexor (i.e., compliance checking is implemented in a network appliance, page 3, lines 28-44), and transferring the information transmitted by the conforming client to the determined network for conforming clients (i.e., complying clients are assigned to the compliant network, col. 3, lines 28-44, and therefore able to transmit and receive data communications on that network). Therefore, the limitations of claim 8 are rejected in the analysis of claim 7 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With regard to claim 9, Hare teaches wherein the telecommunication network is a network of the GigaEthernet type (i.e., a LAN utilizing an Ethernet protocol, page 2, section 0017 and it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a GigaEthernet type), and in that the point-to-point transport protocol is a protocol in accordance with recommendation RFC 2516 (i.e., PPPoE, page 2, section 0016, PPPoE is in accordance with RFC 2516). Hare and Sobel do not teach the access control protocol is a protocol of the 8021x type. However, Malik teaches the access control protocol is a protocol of the 8021x type (i.e., access control using the 802.1x standard, pages 2-3). Therefore, the limitations of claim 9 are rejected in the analysis of claim 7 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With regard to claim 10, Hate teaches wherein the information transmitted according to the point-to-point transport protocol is in the form of packets, and the session concentrator, before transferring the information transmitted by the non-

conforming client in the established session to a network for clients that conform to the access control protocol, forms information frames from the packets (i.e., a concentrator sending and receiving information using PPPoE, Fig. 1, and page 2, section 0015, because broadly construed a packet is any unit of data transferred over a network, frames are packets at layer two, and a concentrator is a layer two device, therefore the data sent is in the form of packets and information frames are formed from the packets).

### ***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK PFIZENMAYER whose telephone number is (571)270-7214. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Hwang can be reached on (571)272-4036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Pfizenmayer  
Patent Examiner  
7 May 2008

/Joon H. Hwang/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2447